

CITY-COUNTY COMMON

County-City Building • 555 S. 10th Street • Lincoln, NE 68508

County Commissioners
(402) 441-7447

Mayor
(402) 441-7511

City Council
(402) 441-7515

COMMON AGENDA TUESDAY, JULY 8, 2003 3:00 p.m. Conference Room 113 (*REVISED*)

I. MINUTES

3:00 p.m. A. Minutes of Common Meeting of June 2, 2003

II. PRESENTATIONS

3:05 p.m. A. PW/Planning - Homestead Expressway Update

4:00 p.m. B. COMMON BUDGET HEARINGS :

COMMONS MEETINGS - Tuesday, July 8, 2003 in Conference Room 113

4:00 p.m. Health

4:30 p.m. Human Services & Justice Council

4:45 p.m. Commons votes on forwarding JBC recommendations

5:00 p.m. Special Needs

5:15 p.m. Women's Commission

5:30 p.m. Emergency Services

5:45 p.m. Corrections

6:00 p.m. BREAK

6:30 p.m. Juvenile Diversion

6:45 p.m. Aging

7:15 p.m. Information Services

7:30 p.m. Personnel (excludes Risk Management)

7:45 p.m. Planning

8:00 p.m. Public Building Commission

8:15 p.m. Diversion Services

***8:30 p.m. 911 Communication & Radio Maintenance**

III ADJOURNMENT - Approx. *8:45 p.m.

CITY-COUNTY COMMON

County-City Building • 555 S. 10th Street • Lincoln, NE 68508

County Commissioners
(402) 441-7447

Mayor
(402) 441-7511

City Council
(402) 441-7515

COMMON MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday, July 8th, 2003

3:00 p.m. - Expressway

4:00 p.m. - Common Budget

County/City Building - Room 113

COUNCIL MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Ken Svoboda, Common Chair, Jon Camp; Jonathan Cook; Glenn Friendt; Annette McRoy (Budget Hearings); Patte Newman; Terry Werner; *COUNCIL MEMBERS ABSENT:* Annette McRoy - Absent for Expressway Meeting
MAYOR SENG: In Attendance.

COUNTY BOARD MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Ray Stevens, Common Vice-Chair; Bernie Heier, Larry Hudkins; Deb Schorr; Bob Workman; *COUNTY BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT:* None

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE: Clarence & Charlene Johnson, Glenn and Reta Harms; Wayne & Lil Giebelhaus, Carol and Larry Hillis, Tom Barclay, Roger Yant, and several other Citizens;; Dale & Joni Mueller, Salt Valley View Association; Troy Pekas and Barb Bettin, YMCA; Phyllis Hergenrader, Friends of Wilderness Park; Bob Grundman, Optimist Youth Sports Complex; Dan Jerred, Salt Valley View Neighborhood Association; Steve Garbe, Mike Malone - Olsson Associates, Lou Lenzen, Monty Fredrickson, Nebraska Department of Roads; Mike Brienzo, V. Singh, Randy Hoskins, and Allan Abbott, Director, - Public Works; Kent Morgan, Marvin Krout, Director -Planning; Directors and Department Staff from Various Departments in attendance for the Budget presentations; Gwen Thorpe, Kerry Eagan, County Board; Joan Ray, Council Secretary; Darrell Podany, Aide to Council Members Camp, Friendt and Svoboda

1. MINUTES

(1) Common Meeting of Monday, June 2, 2003

Mr. Ray Stevens, while awaiting the arrival of Chair Ken Svoboda, opened the meeting and stated that, lacking a quorum of the City Council at this point, they would postpone the approval of the minutes and begin with the presentations. Mr. Svoboda arrived immediately thereafter and called for approval of the above-listed minutes. Ms. Newman requested that the minutes be amended to show her attendance. Jon Camp moved approval of the minutes, as amended. The motion was seconded by Deb Schorr and carried by the following vote: AYES Jon Camp, Glenn Friendt, Larry Hudkins, Deb Schorr, Patte Newman, Ray Stevens, Ken Svoboda, Bob Workman ABSTAINING: Bernie Heier; NAYS: None

THIS MEETING WAS SCHEDULED TO ADDRESS:

HOMESTEAD EXPRESSWAY UPDATE

COMMON BUDGET HEARINGS :

(COMMONS MEETINGS - Tuesday, July 8, 2003 in Conference Room 113)

4 p.m.	Health
4:30 p.m.	Human Services & Justice Council
4:45 p.m.	Commons votes on forwarding JBC recommendations
5 p.m.	Special Needs
5:15 p.m.	Women's Commission
5:30 p.m.	Emergency Services
5:45 p.m.	Corrections
6 p.m.	BREAK
6:30 p.m.	Juvenile Diversion
6:45 p.m.	Aging
7:15 p.m.	Information Services
7:30 p.m.	Personnel (excludes Risk Management)
7:45 p.m.	Planning
8 p.m.	Public Building Commission
8:15 p.m.	Diversion Services
*8:30 p.m.	911 Communication & Radio Maintenance)

HOMESTEAD EXPRESSWAY UPDATE - Mr. Randy Hoskins, City Traffic Engineer and Monty Fredrickson of the Nebraska Department of Roads, made the presentation on the Homestead Expressway. Mike Malone of Olsson & Associates was in attendance to answer any questions.

Mr. Hoskins stated that they would be providing an over-view and an up-date as to what is happening with the U.S. Highway 77 Upgrade from Expressway Standard to a Freeway Standard. He gave a brief back-ground review of the materials the Common Members had received. These materials showed the twenty-five year build-out time frame on the project as it currently exists. Land Uses show mostly Residential with a few locations shown as Commercial; the proposed roadway network was noted with the comment that the interchanges at Capital Parkway and Warlick are shown as being constructed, while the intersection at Pioneer and Old Cheney with U.S. 77 is shown in the Comp Plan as being an area for further study.

With the South Beltway Agreement that was signed by the Mayor and Chairman of the County Board, when the South Beltway is constructed -as part of that agreement- U.S. 77 will be upgraded to Freeway Standards - basically getting rid of all at-grade intersections, and having either interchanges, bridges over, or possibly, the removal of some of these roads. That agreement is in place and at this point, it is everyone's intent to follow through with that agreement. Mr. Friendt asked if it could be rescinded? The answer was that it could be.

Mr. Svoboda, at this point, announced to the guests who were in attendance, that this was not a public hearing on this issue. Other than the presenters, no one will have an opportunity to speak today. This is merely an informational meeting for the City Council and County Commissioners. He added with certainty that there would be numerous options for those present to speak at public hearings.

Mr. Fredrickson continued the review of the materials he had distributed to the Common Members. He pointed out that there were two key study assumptions defined based on discussions with the City and the State staff at the onset of the project. One is that the closure of Yankee Hill and Rokeby Roads at Highway 77 was assumed for purposes of this study and for transportation modeling. The second assumption was that there would be no interchange at Old Cheney Road as part of this study. In this location

over-pass options were also considered. There had also been consideration of closure/overpass- and interchange options at Pioneers Boulevard. Those three areas were the focal points of the study.

Through the review, several questions were raised. One was on what basis was the Old Cheney Road closure made? Mr. Fredrickson stated that there were a number of reasons that determination was made jointly by City, State and the private consultant team. An interchange didn't make sense at Old Cheney Road because, first and most importantly, it is not required in order to provide acceptable levels of service. Based on the transportation model results and on our more detailed traffic operations analysis of the adjacent study area roadways and intersections, it is not needed in order to provide good levels of service at the other roadways. Spacing was also a primary consideration. There is about three-quarters of a mile between Old Cheney and Warlick. Typically in an urban area, two-mile spacing is preferred, ideally. One mile is typically what you see in urban areas; but this would fall below the sufficient spacing criteria that the Department of Roads and the City would like to see.

Safety and Railroad conflicts there with the number of trains that go through the area were considerations. There are also flood plain and environmental impacts with the Wilderness Park and the Salt Creek flood plain that were also factors in our determinations. These factors were verified as we went back through the study process.

The review continued with notations of travel time, railroad conflicts, flood plain and environmental impacts, development potential and accessibility, the cost of the various options and, finally, a summarization of the study findings.

The summary confirmed that the closure of Rokeby and Yankee Hill at Highway 77 would not have any significant impact based on the road system and land use development patterns that are anticipated at this time; the interchange at the intersection of Warlick, closure at Old Cheney (after review of an over-pass and closure options), an interchange at Pioneers Boulevard, along with various road widenings and modifications, makes an adequate and robust roadway system in that area - even with the Old Cheney closing.

Common Members voiced concerns on who would be undertaking the construction of the roadway improvements mentioned; what the impact of an extension of Yankee Hill Road through Wilderness Park would be, the connection between this roadway and the South Beltway and other engineering configurations, and east-west traffic flow and harvest traffic. These concerns were addressed by Staff. Common members wanted to emphasize the future growth of this area and their concern with the closing of Old Cheney. Discussion on these concerns was extensive. It was noted that the cost of a full-fledged interchange at Old Cheney would be approx. \$6-9,000,000. The cost of an over-pass or under-pass was estimated at between \$2-3,000,000. Mr. Stevens stated that he felt that an over-pass at Pioneers and Old Cheney instead of the interchange at Pioneers would be more economically feasible, and would better handle the through traffic that the expressway is intended to handle.

Mr. Fredrickson stated that there will be open house meetings beginning in October of this year to study the upgrade of the West By-pass. That will be the first public meeting for comment. Depending on how that goes, there could be a Formal Public Hearing in about March of 2004. After that point, it gets thrown back to the elected officials as far as the Spring Comp Plan hearings and what gets added into the Comp Plan regarding where the interchanges and over-passes would be located. The State would hope to reach consensus with the Common on what that plan would be - and that would be added to the Comp Plan. Then the State would take it to the Highway Commission after that was done. At the earliest, all of those things won't be completed until August of next year.

Mr. Svoboda asked how the open-house meeting in October would be advertised. Mr. Fredrickson stated that it would be published in the legal notices. He noted that they have the names and will send a personal invitation to those people interested and/or affected by the changes.

The final bit of discussion involved the interchange at 14th and Warlick Boulevard. The

thought of giving up any roads concerned Mr. Hoskins, but the question is do we have the capacity to move that traffic in other places. The train tracks were another concern and it would be difficult to put in any sort of over-pass to circumvent those tracks. To put in an over-pass you must take out houses and put roads through peoples' front yards. The other concern is, again, the impacts on Wilderness Park. Any sort of over-pass will end up being out into some of the Wilderness Park area.

To best move traffic with the least environmental impact, it was agreed that the State proposal to close the Old Cheney crossing be accepted. City staff would come back in and re-design the intersection at 14th & Warlick and Old Cheney, taking out the west leg of Old Cheney at the intersection and, instead, bring Warlick in as the fourth or West leg of that intersection. This would make it a standard, four-legged intersection with some minor changes to the neighborhood traffic flow to expedite the traffic in and out of the area. Looking at the over-all impact, and based on the State's study, Staff felt that this would work fairly well and would continue to move traffic out there using this plan.

The layout of the roadway was explained in greater detail. The access of the two neighborhoods north and south of Old Cheney was discussed. The only access to the Salt Valley View Neighborhood would be at one intersection, plus West 1st Street. So, emergency vehicles might have a problem with train traffic. Mr. Hoskins stated that they had hired Olsson & Associates to do the design of this intersection. We haven't begun that yet, and we need to work out some of these other issues first. One thing that we will ask them to look at will be appropriate access for the neighborhoods. The church was also mentioned as a traffic concern. The mill traffic would have to be routed to Pioneers, which would probably require an upgrade at Pioneers.

It was asked why the two neighborhoods couldn't be joined. Mr. Hoskins noted that in the original plan they had been, but at the objection of the neighborhood, that option had been removed. Common Members noted that perhaps, with the new plan, the neighborhood might want that access re-inserted into the plans. It was believed that there should be neighborhood meetings for those neighborhoods who will be affected by these changes.

Mr. Svoboda, in summary, observed that ultimately, the City Council, County Commissioners and the Mayor have the final say on this project. And, ultimately, we must answer to the dozens of people being affected and the thousands of citizens of Lincoln. He was curious as to the over-all cost split of the project. (Between the State & Local -City/County) Mr. Fredrickson stated that tentatively, the West By-Pass Upgrade....right now much of the work is outside the City Limits, so almost all of the monies now would be Department of Roads money. Part of the South Beltway Agreement was that the State would pick up the cost of the Warlick interchange, no matter what. With us funding the whole thing, it puts a different light on it too....on what the State considers as a Highway System and a 'want' versus a 'need'. What do we consider as adequate and proper in spacing of interchanges.

Mr. Svoboda stated that, though they were not traffic engineers, the Common Members were able to recognize need and that might very well be a pretty dramatic want as well. If we can ultimately find the dollars to front an over-pass or two over-passes over Old Cheney and Pioneers, are we far enough along in the design of this that that cannot be discussed. Or, are we at a point where we could stop it, bring those two scenarios in and request, (even if the numbers don't indicate that this is necessary, but we feel that it is a need and if we can fund it), that you to do it.

Mr. Fredrickson stated that the project is in the very early stages of design. Its concept was, ideally, when the South Beltway is completed, we should complete the upgrade of the West By-Pass at the same time so you have two freeway systems. Obviously, development in the Warlick area may force all of us to think about an interchange at Warlick sooner than anything else. Can we get that done - get the funds set aside? We don't have any funds set aside for this at the present time.

The other problem is the City and the 14th and Old Cheney intersection needs some help. We need to do something there. That is of the most critical need. If we can get together on what is going to happen, we'd know how to design that intersection.

Mr. Svoboda stated that on the West "A" Street Over-pass, it was a very successful project

because we gave every stakeholder, whether residents or businesses in the area, several options. We asked their input on each one and they were able to come up with the options that most closely suited their mutual needs. He asked if we had the ability to do that on this one at the public hearings or informational meetings in October? Could we have options for them to review at that time on both Pioneer and/or Old Cheney?

Mr. Fredrickson stated that they still have quite a bit of flexibility for the open house. He stated that they had thought that an interchange at Warlick, with its connection to Denton Road and everything would just probably have to be there, no matter what happens. We've been planning an interchange at Warlick and Pioneers for the last twenty years. They were in the plan when we first drew up the West Bypass. After questions, it was stated that the State would like to have a consensus with the local entities in this development. He noted that there would be certain things where the State will draw the line and say "we will not fund this feature...because we feel it would be an "extra", but it won't hurt the freeway and if you want to do it, you can - at your expense." We're all in it together.

Mr. Cook asked for clarification on the cost of the Over/Under-Pass at Old Cheney. The more exact figure would be 3.8 million dollars, not 2-3 million or 5 million (as had been mentioned at an earlier meeting)

Mr. Werner stated that he wanted it to be understood that when Mr. Svoboda says "we" and "us", he -Mr. Werner- might have different opinions on this and he would like to hear from the neighbors. When we're talking about spending this kind of money, he was not sure he was "on board". He didn't want the State or Staff to feel like we've got consensus here to move forward on this. His inclination was to say you've done a great job and it looks good, as it is.

Mr. Camp noted that as Lincoln grows over the next 20 years, he is concerned about the east-west connections. He has seen how we've hurt ourselves in the north-south connections. In Omaha, they've preserved quite a few fairly good one-mile/east-west connections and he would like to do the same in Lincoln. This seems to be a road block to that connectivity.

Mr. Hudkins, commenting on the dangerous aspect of the 14th & Warlick intersection, if it is necessary to make that a four-way, straight-away intersection, asked if it had been considered to bring West Denton Road into Old Cheney and taking Old Cheney across the railroad track and the West Bypass and make that the road and make Warlick the secondary road? In answer, it was noted that if we were starting fresh, that would be a preferred option. The problem with that is the railroad is already there and is a higher grade facility than Old Cheney. In Old Cheney, you've got homes fronting it; then we'd have to deal with issues of getting through Wilderness Park, over the tracks, over the creek. If you're laying out a transportation system, that's probably the one you'd want, but the time has past that it would be viable.

Mr. Friendt asked about the Wilderness Park taboo? The plans that are set right now don't touch Wilderness Park at all. Would that be the kiss of death? Mr. Fredrickson answered that the rules state that you must not take 4-F Parkland if you have a reasonable and prudent alternative. So, there's your gray area. There have been several court cases wherein Cities, Counties, Departments of Transportation, have thought that they had no reasonable, prudent alternatives and that they should take park land....and the courts have called it both ways. It is a very difficult process and has gotten harder over the last twenty years.

Mr. Svoboda asked, on behalf of the Common Members, if those citizens in attendance at today's meeting were willing to do so, would they offer a show of hands poll. How many are For Closure of Old Cheney and who would be Open to an Over-Pass Interchange and thirdly, those who just don't care:

- 1) - Closure of Old Cheney - Approx. 1/3 (4)
- 2)) - Keeping Old Cheney Open/Overpass - Approx 2/3 (8)
- 3) - Just Don't Care - 0

The meeting recessed briefly at 4:05 and reconvened to address the Common Budget portion of the Agenda:
COMMON BUDGET HEARINGS - *All reports are on file in the City Budget Office and in the Offices of*

the City Council and the County Commissioners.

COMMONS MEETINGS - Tuesday, July 8, 2003 in Conference Room 113

4 p.m.	Health
4:30 p.m.	Human Services & Justice Council
4:45 p.m.	Commons votes on forwarding JBC recommendations
5 p.m.	Special Needs
5:15 p.m.	Women's Commission
5:30 p.m.	Emergency Services
5:45 p.m.	Corrections
6 p.m.	BREAK
6:30 p.m.	Juvenile Diversion
6:45 p.m.	Aging
7:15 p.m.	Information Services
7:30 p.m.	Personnel (excludes Risk Management)
7:45 p.m.	Planning
8 p.m.	Public Building Commission
8:15 p.m.	Diversion Services
8:30 p.m.	911 Communication & Radio Maintenance

HEALTH: Mr. Bruce Dart, Director of the Health Department and Ms. Kathy Cook, Health Department Budget Officer, came forward for the presentation. He explained that they had an extremely complicated budget but would try to break it down to a manageable summary. The bottom line is that the budget this year will allow us to address and meet our public health goals and objectives and mandates to insure the health of our community in Lincoln/Lancaster County.

This past year was very successful at the Health Department. Our re-organization is almost completed. Our strategic planning was started in May, 2002 and is almost completed. We're moving to the last stages of that. We're really starting to apply public health practices with data, if you look at our outcomes in the community - and the budget will reflect that ability. We didn't have that ability before to really evaluate our progress in what we're doing. Now, because of our strategic planning, we're able to more efficiently use our resources, including the funds that we're receiving from the Common.

We're a population based entity. We service the whole community. We have some clinical practice where there is one-on-one services within the health department, but we merged those two [community/individual] to seriously effect our health status in Lincoln/Lancaster County. He offered to answer any questions the Common Members might have.

Ms. Newman asked Mr. Dart how he had managed to achieve \$30,000 in the negative for print copies? Ms. Cook stated that she had gone through looking at the prior year experience and what was built into that. The current rate is the most accurate forecast of what we could do. Mr. Dart noted that it was projection. We'll look at off-setting that as the year progresses through other savings. We try to project accurately and based on past experience, that's unfortunately an accurate projection.

Mr. Werner asked for a brief summary of where the additional half a million dollars that you're requesting will go, noting that there is an approximate half a million dollars difference between last years budget request and this years request. Ms. Cook stated that the occupation tax [revenue] and restoration of public health [inaudible] programs which, because of funding considerations were cut last year and now it is added back in.

Mr. Dart added that there would be additional funds seen, due to the LB692 Tobacco funds -

they've increased our revenue funds, but the increase is minimal. Mr. Werner asked why the City portion was more than the County portion and wondered what that was about. Ms. Cook stated that that was the debt service. In the past year, up to this point, the debt services is split 50/50 between the City and the County. In the past year, because of County requirements for financing, they paid off their share of the debt service completely by doing that in this fiscal year. So, next year's fiscal year only includes the City portion of the debt service. That is why the proportion is different.

Mr. Werner asked if we were getting everything that we've gotten in the past and did Mr. Dart expect that to continue? Mr. Dart stated that they would actually receive an increase because they increased our "per capita". That money is based on population.

Mr. Svoboda asked if the insect foggers were included in this budget. They were not. Mr. Dart stated that there would be no increase in staff because of the spraying program. He explained that they would use the current staff and also Parks Department and Public Works personnel as well to implement the program. The cost of the insecticide itself would be taken from the Health Department Budget as a part of the whole program.

HUMAN SERVICES AND JUSTICE COUNCIL Ms. Kit Boesch came forward to report on the Human Services Budget. She reported that the Human Services and Justice Council's budget for the fiscal year is \$205,748. She stated that she would review the budget briefly and answer any questions. She noted that there were only three on staff - the grants administrator, the office assistant and herself. The grants administrator is currently administering about 3.8 million dollars worth of grants for the City and County - mostly the County. In accordance with the fiscal office of the County, we were given the steps for those positions and the increase in the total salary budget is \$6,660.00 .

In non-personnel items, the only real explanation probably needs to be on the \$15,000 being asked for. Ann Hobbs is our contract evaluator from the Justice Council. Right now, she does all juvenile evaluations. Currently she is paid out of grant funds; next year she will probably also be paid out of grant funds that we receive, however, LB640 money comes from the Legislature - and this, to say the least, is not a sure thing. When we actually have it in hand is when we know we have it. Ann's salary is in that LB640 money. When we get it, we can take it out of this budget. If we don't get it, then it would be important to the City and the County to maintain that contract position because she does an excellent job of base-line data. Currently she is doing base-line data for the Juvenile Justice System.

There is an increase in rent - approximately \$80.00 more than what is shown in the budget print out. The split with the Human Services/Justice Council has always been 50/50 Half from the City, Half from the County. So, that comes out to \$102,874 + \$40.00 for the rent.

Ms. Deb Schorr asked, regarding LB640, when does it say the funds would be dispersed if the funds are available to disperse? Ms. Boesch stated that last year, they were supposed to get that money in July and got it in November. The year before we were supposed to get it in July and never saw it at all.

Mr. Camp asked if, when these personnel steps are put in the budget, is there the assumption that everyone will get that? Ms. Boesch stated that is the assumption. Those are generally the figures that the budget officer sends over...showing the merit raises. Mr. Camp noted that that was a concern on the City side with a concern that there is such a high percentage - that the raise is just automatic. He wondered what percentage of the County merit raises are just automatic...or is it truly a merit raise. Ms. Boesch did not know. She indicated that in the past, everyone has just given staff a raise. Mr. Hudkins noted that the Director's raise is at the pleasure of the County Board. Mr. Camp noted that he was asking because the City had been heavily criticized for having 98% of employees receiving merit increases. He wanted to be sure that the raises are given truly on merit and not just as an automatic raise. Ms. Boesch stated that she would be glad to tell what the staff does. Mr. Camp indicated that he was simply speaking generally. Mr. Friendt asked if that merit increase was built into this budget. Ms. Boesch stated that it was.

COMMONS VOTES ON FORWARDING JBC [JOINT BUDGET COMMITTEE]

RECOMMENDATIONS Ms. Boesch presented to the Common two hand-outs on JBC Special Projects and a Summary of Information from JBC. She noted that the Joint Budget Committee was looking at holding at a 3% or less increase, recognizing the budget constraints from both the City and County side. Ms. Boesch reported that request to the agencies. She had requested that they come in with realistic expectations for their various budgets. She noted that the agencies did a very good job at complying with that request this year.

The summary information shows a total allocation last year of \$1,899,480. This year we're recommending \$1,942,755, which is a 2.03% over-all increase. She explained how this "shook out" with the City and the County. The County is being asked for \$1,479,880 and we're asking the City for \$462,875. The increase on the City side is 1.9%; the increase on the County side is 2.4%. The division by agency and by program is in the sheet of small print. But it shows the allocation received last year and the recommended allocation for this year and it shows how it is split out between the City and the County.

She asked if, before she went into the Special Projects, there were any questions on the JBC recommendations? Mr. Werner observed that last year there were three or four agencies with which there had been concerns and monies were being held back - are there any this year and if so, can you give us a little synopsis of those? Mr. Boesch answered that, generally, you could look under contingencies - that's where those concerns would be noted. The contingencies cited this year are with the Indian Center, with the Lincoln Inter-faith Council, with the Malone Center and Madonna Rehabilitation Center. Each of them have different contingencies that are spelled out in the letters that went to them. Generally speaking, Ms. Boesch noted that sometimes it's in budgeting....we ask for clarification or clearer break-down in the budget as to what it is they are asking for. In some cases (for example - the Indian Center) - last year they had problems. We want to know that their fourth quarter report is going to be okay before we allocate them money. The contingency with Inter-Faith Council is a more detailed budget; the contingency with Madonna is that with their medical transportation that they become involved with the C-SIP Transportation Coalition rather than staying separate and apart and that they get more involved with the Federation so there is more involvement with the community. The Malone Center after-school program is simply to say that when you have your program designed, we want to see it. Most of you are familiar with the situation at Malone Center. We can't fund them a particular amount of money for a program that exists, because it doesn't exist. Yet, if you don't fund the program, nothing will ever happen. The contingency is approval of their designed program before the allocation is given. Most of these contingencies are included in the contracts. Mr. Werner stated that, maybe with the exception of the Indian Center, you would expect all of those departments to meet the contingency requirements? Ms. Boesch stated that she expected all of the Departments to meet the requirements.

Ms. Boesch continued with her presentation. She noted that there were no appeals of the recommendations at this time. Mr. Camp asked if there were some areas here where there might be some duplication we could correct in order to get a bigger bang for the dollar out of the City/County Funds? Ms. Boesch stated that, for example, the pantry system is an automated computer system that tracks all of our pantries here in town. The Food Bank is actually where the food comes from. She commented that there were 16 pantries in the community now. If someone stops at one of the pantries and is served today, they go into the computer system. Then, if they go to another one of the pantries tomorrow, they would come up as having already been served. Ms. Boesch stated that, as we ask questions about other agencies, she would encourage Common Members to ask those questions and call her and get the answers. If there are questions, it is generally because there is a misunderstanding of the system and how it works.

Mr. Ray Stevens commented that he had been working in this area for several years for United Way and as a volunteer in several organizations and now as a member of this group. He felt that the level of cooperation between the agencies is outstanding. The auditing for the JBC is done by the United Way and he thought that was on the tip of everyone's mind - are they collaborating with other agencies and Mr. Stevens felt they were. He added that they had the Director of the Community Mental Health Center at the meeting, and he has worked very, very hard with other agencies in the community to provide services to his clientele and

to assist other agencies. Mr. Stevens noted that he was very impressed by the level of collaboration amongst all of the agencies.

Mr. Workman noted, that as a new member to JBC, he was very impressed with the detail that goes into their considerations. He felt there were no dollars going out that were not justified. He noted that the requests to JBC this year had been 2.7 million, so it's not an easy job - we have to say no to a number of requests.

Ms. Boesch continued, noting that in addition to the JBC presentation, there is a special project - the Low Income Transportation Project. That project is a \$55,000 project on the City side. This particular project had been under StarTran for many years. StarTran really didn't want to do that, because it takes a lot of time and a lot of monitoring. They didn't have the staffing to cover the federal monitoring required. The program was switched over to Human Services Office about six years ago. It has been held at \$55,000 for three years. Questions regarding duplication of services have been asked, but Ms. Boesch stated that this year would be a good time for a good strong review as to where this fits with the C-SIP Transportation Project; where it sits in the focus of the City Transportation System and how we want to deal with Low Income Transportation. This year, its third year at that \$55,000 rate, would be a good year to review and determine whether or not we should continue.

The three sub-contracts are with Community Alternatives, Nebraska HHS and LAP. LAP is the one agency that does not just serve their clients....they serve about 17 other agencies with passports, ticket booklets and individual single tickets to different agencies for their clientele. The money goes a long way and to a good purpose. The question is how does this fit into our over-all transportation plan. Ms. Boesch proposed that it be funded as a Special Project again this year and next year we have some of the questions answered. Mr. Werner asked for more details in the funding between the agencies which Ms. Boesch answered.

The second special project listed on the summary sheet is the Financial Outsourcing project which is also a City project. Ms. Boesch explained the history of this project, noting that this was initiated to give many of the smaller agencies in the area a financial assist by outsourcing their technical assistance, including the auditing of books. This gave credible information while saving the Executive Director a great deal of time. This is the 2nd year of that pilot project and the agencies involved are pleased with the program. In this second year, we will cut their assistance in half so they will begin to own the project. There are a number of applications in from other agency to participate in the program. The cost is approximately \$20,000 - from the City side.

The third Special Project is Hotel/Motel project which is a relatively small project of \$3500 which the County has covered for many years. It is managed by Friendship Home, because most of the Hotel/Motel users are taken from family violence situations. There is excellent accountability with this program and many hotels in Lincoln participate in the program.

The total JBC amount, including these Special Projects, is approximately \$2,021,000. The Breakout of that is \$537,857 for City and \$1,483,380 from the County. The County is required to do a Region V Action Substance Abuse program and we need to match \$77,295 for substance abuse programs.

Mr. Bernie Heier made a motion to move the JBC recommendation forward to the individual governmental bodies for approval. There were several seconds from the Common Members. The motion carried by the following vote: AYES: Jon Camp, Jonathan Cook, Glenn Friendt, Bernie Heier, Larry Hudkins, Annette McRoy, Deb Schorr, Patte Newman, Ray Stevens, Ken Svoboda, Terry Werner, Bob Workman; NAYS: None; ABSTAIN: Mayor Seng.

SPECIAL NEEDS- Mr. Dean Settle, Director of the Community Mental Health Center, came forward

to address the Common. He handed out materials - a general brochure, the latest annual report and some information on a new collaborative project which was alluded to during the previous presentation.

Mr. Settle stated that he was there for the budget review of the Special Services function. This involves one mental health coordinator who responds to special requests for screening and assistance at the jail. The coordinator responds to people at the Mission and at DayWatch. It is not uncommon for us to get calls at the Airport, or at Schumaker's Truck Stop - wherever someone is found in our community who may need a mental health status check. Often police will call this responder from the Mental Health Center to provide that service. Mr. Settle detailed the operation and history of this position. Mr. Settle also reviewed the latest annual report for the Common Members.

Mr. Settle shared with the Common Members an abstract of a new grant they had just received from SAMSA (Substance Abuse Mental Health Service Agency) for the Federal Government. He noted that Lincoln in one of seven communities chosen in the United States to have a mental health jail diversion grant. (A Federal grant) People who are brought to the booking desk for non-violent crimes need not occupy a jail bed - they'll be diverted into the community mental health center where there will be a licensed mental health professional to do a triage and move them into a very intensive case management structure. It's a much better way of handling persons with mental illness. It should be a win-win for taxpayers and can delay building a new jail a little longer by getting this population out of those beds.

He continued, explaining the security arrangements, with the grant, after discharge issues are also addressed (i.e. getting to doctors appointments and court appearances) The Grant has already been received and is \$238,000 per year for three years. We're hiring a manager this week and will be hiring the licensed mental health professional and the intensive case manager by the end of the month. We'll probably begin receiving diversion cases by the end of August. He felt the program being in place helped greatly in Lincoln receiving this federal grant.

Mr. Settle commented that they are managing 700 cases in their Case Management System. These are chronically mentally ill people who have a case manager. We know who the people are, what their cycles of behavior are; we know who they go to for their medicine and health needs; we do a very remarkable job in this Community Health Center with the chronically mentally ill. He noted that not all communities do that. The annual report only reflects the people who have open cases. There are probably two contacts for every one that is admitted into the mental health center system.

Mr. Svoboda noted that the age group the Center works with is eighteen years. Mr. Settle explained that the Center serves adults where the Child Guidance works with kids eighteen and younger. Mr. Svoboda stated that his point was asking about the diversion program - is that strictly adults? It was. He asked if there is a model out there that could be done for youth as well? Mr. Settle said that there were a few. He commented that he had been involved in a program at CenterPointe where there was an evening reporting center there. There are some other kinds of programs that are certainly very effective. Mr. Svoboda stated that he could see the advantage of getting them at a younger age and getting them the help at that stage would be much easier, and probably cheaper than getting them at the adult age. Ms. McRoy added that they do have a Juvenile Diversion Program that had just been started up over the last two years at the New Attention Center.

WOMEN'S COMMISSION - Ms. Bonnie Coffey came forward to make the presentation for the Women's Commission. Ms. Coffey thanked the Common members for being a governing body in a City that understands and appreciates the value of a Women's Commission. She passed out to the Common Members a brief over-view of what the Women's Commission has done for the past year.

She noted that some of what has been done dove-tails with what will be coming up in the next year. When the Womens Voices Survey was published, it was learned that there were a couple of areas that

needed specific attention and basically provided [information base] for our strategic planning. We are now focusing on women's health and women's leadership. There are some programs in the coming budget that are specifically designed around these two areas. In addition, we work with the community learning center project. She noted that she served as the Mayor's Liaison to the Management Team. The City received a 30 month technical assistance grant from the National League of Cities and she is working with that. She is also working with Early Education and Care and Youth Development for C-SIP. With the Youth Development, she stated that they had been able to secure a \$7,000 grant from the Kaufmann Foundation in Kansas City to begin to train youth development workers. We've just received a \$16,000 grant from United Way. This lets us have a focus on Early Care and Education.

She reviewed a break-down of information that gave a five-year overview of the Women's Commission action. She outlined the personnel costs, the fixed costs and the required expenditures. She noted that the Women's Commission probably offers the best value for your dollar. We have worked at bringing in some additional dollars. The Lincoln *Journal Star* continues to underwrite our "Women Talk" television program so there is no cost to the City for those.

Mr. Bob Workman stated that before the County got into this fiscal mess last year and had problems balancing our budget, we asked the County Attorney if he would give us a list of agencies which were not mandated. It was a pretty slim list and one of the agencies on that list was the Women's Commission. It is something that we're not required to fund. He commented that he was comparing the \$145,000 Women's Commission budget for next year with the \$205,000 budget for Human Services and Justice Council, which he was sure were mandated programs. He noted that he also compared it with the Special Needs Budget of \$63,000 and the fact that they are serving 200 very needy clients at \$300 per client. He asked Ms. Coffey to tell him the true value of the Women's Commission. He added that he was not asking, necessarily from a dollar standpoint, but from the standpoint of our society today. Why is this a priority for our funding? Why should we be spending tax dollars on this agency?

Ms. Coffey answered that it was because women continue to be disproportionately affected by what happens in our society; because we still don't have equal pay; because we still don't have "zero rapes"; because we still have women who are not in jobs that provide them with a living income - for a number of reasons.

Ms. Coffey stated that when she was hired for this job, one of the questions had been "do you ever see a time when the Women's Commission won't be needed. Her response had been that she hoped so, but did not believe it would happen in her lifetime. Women continue to need to have supportive services. Gender issues transcend ethnic and race issues, so, we're working with a variety of women in our community. She believed that as the community begins to grow in diversity, that it will become even more important for women to be able to find a place where they can be heard; find a place where we provide some services. We don't provide any direct services, but we provide information referral, listening to what is needed in the community and then providing some programming around those needs.

Mr. Workman answered that he did not disapprove anything that Ms. Coffey had said. He commented that he has often said that he hoped we were all adult enough that someday we will not require expenditures in areas such as this to tell us that women are a very valued part of our society and something that we should esteem; but the question he is asking himself is "are we adult enough today to realize that?" or will it be some years from now? He would hope that day, if it isn't today, comes soon.

Ms. Coffey commented that the interlocal agreement outlines what the Women's Commission is charged with - which is primarily to advise the Mayor and City Council and County Commission on the issues that [inaudible]. There are a whole host of things underneath that. She believed, given the funding that they have received, they've done a pretty darn good job. If the Common sees that interlocal agreement does not outline exactly what this body wants the Women's Commission to do, then we need to take a look at that. Ms. Coffey stated that she did not believe that anyone could find anything wrong in the ways in which the

Commission had met the challenges and the duties set forth in the interlocal agreement.

Mr. Werner asked when the Women's Commission started? She answered that it was in 1976. He asked if there had been an increase in female employees for the City and County? Ms. Coffey answered that Nebraska rates in the top five states in the nation with the percentage of women who work outside the home. Lincoln, as a City, also is in top five cities in the country in the number of women who work outside the home. Mr. Werner asked if the City and County employment had increased for women. Ms. Coffey stated that it had, but not to the extent that she would like to see it, nor in the areas where she would like to see it. Mr. Werner asked how the pay equity for the City and County rated? Ms. Coffey stated that Nebraska continues to rank below the national average [on the ratio of the women to men pay scale] which right now it is 76 cents on the dollar; the last report that we got for Lincoln was 68 cents [paid to women] for every dollar [paid to men]. It's less for Hispanic and African-American women.

Mr. Werner asked about City and County Government in regard to that issue? Ms. Coffey commented that in City and County Government it is probably much more equitable, simply because those jobs are set with salaries that are geared to a specific position - with no matter to gender. Unfortunately, we have a lot of women who are in clerical positions. Mr. Werner asked if the Women's Commission took calls with complaints on governmental employment discrepancies? Ms. Coffey answered that those calls go to the Affirmative Action Officer, who works with Ms. Coffey on those issues.

Mr. Werner changed the subject to day-care. He noted that there has been a huge cut in day-care and he asked if the Women's Commission was doing anything in that area? Ms. Coffey answered that that is what the C-SIP Early Care Education Committee was for. She stated that they had just begun to visit people who are responsible for those items. Mr. Werner asked if there was a need for a day-care center for the County or City employees? Ms. Coffey stated that there is always a need for day-care centers - particularly with infant care. There is a real shortage of infant care and care for children with special needs.

Ms. Newman commented that she knew that this Women's Commission does a tremendous job of pulling things together for the community. They're not things that you see on this budget list, but there are things that Bonnie does through C-SIP and other agencies to let people know what is going on out there. She stated that she felt the Commission is providing a valuable service and she would hate to see any funding cuts.

Ms. McRoy gave an example of a young woman, a graduate of Wesleyan University, whom Ms. McRoy had referred to the Women's Commission several weeks ago. The young woman was interested in International Studies and needed to network with other women to determine how she could get the dream job she wanted and Ms. McRoy had spent time with her, but ended up thinking that the best source of help for the young lady would be Ms. Coffey and the Women's Commission. The Commission was holding a networking event where she was able to find people and sources to help her in her search. Without the Commission's intervention, this lady would not have been helped.

Mr. Stevens stated that the requested budget of \$136,234.00, in the Mayor's Budget shows a slightly higher amount - \$145,000.00. The discrepancy was determined to have been an inclusion of benefits in the Mayor's Budget the correct figure would \$143,081.00 plus cost of living. In order to get to the percentage amount required for the budget she had to put a person on three-quarters time so that quarter of time was not put in so we could maintain the position. There are three people on the Women's Commission. Ms. Coffey has been there eight years and they have not increased personnel costs in those eight years. It's hard to keep 3/4 of a person - so she would need to change those numbers for the budget.

Ms. Schorr asked if Ms. Coffey wasn't going to give Lincoln, NE some national exposure by running for president of a National organization? Ms. Coffey answered that she was on the Board and is running for Secretary this year. In her budget is money....has always been money...to send her to the National Convention. As a Board Member, she must attend the other three Board Meetings. She has split the cost of that with Friends of the Commission - so those [three other] meetings are not at the City's expense. (She'll

be running for president of the organization in 2004).

Mr. Werner asked about the grant money and contributions - how much is that per year? Ms. Coffey stated that in hard dollars this year it would be \$2300.00. The Grant for Youth Development subgroup will go to C-SIP. It won't come to the Women's Commission, but she worked on the Committee to get it done. Certainly, youth development is important. If you look at money that has been given directly to the Women's Commission, from the *Journal Star* and the \$500 grant from the Women's Bureau, would total \$2300.00.

EMERGENCY SERVICES Mr. Doug Ahlberg came forward to make the presentation. He explained the weather emergency that had taken place the previous evening. He stated that the major increase they had in the budget was outside warning devices for the City and County. This increases the amount of repair we have had done. There has been an increase in the number of radios we have available. There is an additional \$10,000 increase with these outside warning devices. They're situated where they need to be utilized most effectively.

Regarding the upgrade schedule, it is still a considerable amount of money (\$81,570.00) That only goes as far as replacement in the City. We take the systems in and have them re-built, which is a part of the \$34,000.00. On the services that are provided...we place those in the villages out in the County...and in the recreation areas throughout the County, including parks, sports complexes and some State recreation areas. The other area Mr. Ahlberg was looking at for savings was utilizing the older systems along the bike trails that are outside the City. He felt his department was doing a very good job with the resources they had available to them.

Ms. McRoy asked if the newer areas that the City annexed, are they covered by some other system, or is your department taking care of that as well? Mr. Ahlberg answered that two years ago, he had requested that that would be included as part of the infrastructure costs when areas outside the coverage area were annexed. Thus far, he noted, he had not seen any results from that request. He noted several examples of areas that should have systems that at this time do not. The schedule that he was presenting was a replacement schedule and a lot of those areas are outside of the effective range of those sirens. The new sirens that we put in have an effective range of 5,280 feet. They're replacing the system that we have that has a range of 4,000 feet. The new systems cover a broader area, but as the City grows, it is incumbent upon us to collectively say that this is an infrastructure cost. As of a few years ago, he had been of the understanding that that would be the case, but has not seen that being enacted. Ms. McRoy stated that she would follow up on that.

Mr. Werner asked what the cost would be. Mr. Ahlberg noted that it would be \$26,000 per siren, plus installation. Mr. Werner asked if it was Mr. Ahlberg's job to cover the entire county? Mr. Ahlberg stated that his area of responsibility are just those areas within population centers. Mr. Werner noted that the schedule was a 10-year cycle of replacement, so, this does not even count any new equipment. Mr. Ahlberg stated that that was correct.

He added that when the County Board and he had discussed this in past years, he noted that they had added one siren for the City of Lincoln up until this year. The reason, it was their understanding that it would be part of the infrastructure cost as the City expanded - and that did not happen.

Mr. Werner asked, if it is mandated that Mr. Ahlberg cover those areas, how is he doing that? Mr. Ahlberg answered that what has happened is that some of the replacement sirens haven't been replaced. Rather than replacing them, new ones have been put out. Mr. Werner noted then, that this isn't really a replacement schedule, but is providing for new ones too. Mr. Ahlberg stated that it is supposed to be a replacement schedule. He noted that much of the City's siren system was installed back in the 50s & 60s, primarily as air-raid warnings. Originally, the ten year replacement schedule was to replace those. Quite often, they were re-built instead. Mr. Werner asked what a new one would give us that an old one doesn't. Mr.

Ahlberg answered that it would be 1280 feet more coverage. The other thing is that once we have all the newer systems in place, they will not only indicate when we send out a signal to turn them on, they will also transmit back to indicate that they are on - that would be an added functionality.

Mr. Werner asked if this were part of the infrastructure cost to the developer, do you have a sense of how much per household that would be? Mr. Ahlberg answered that it would depend on the size of the development and whether the contractor has been doing a good job of replacing and rebuilding those systems. These systems are extremely important to the citizens of this community and this county. They rely on them quite heavily.

Mr. Friendt asked if those costs had been built into the Homeland Security Plan? Mr. Ahlberg answered that he could not buy outside warning devices through the Homeland Security Fund. Mr. Friendt stated that, in terms of our planning - if we take a look at the infrastructure that may be needed, we're not going to use Homeland Security Funds to build new fire stations either. If we say this is part of the infrastructure for new growth and for protecting our City, it seemed to him that it ought to be plugged in.

Mr. Ahlberg explained that those items cannot be purchased with Homeland Security funds. Mr. Svoboda stated that we need to distinguish between National Homeland Security and local. Mr. Friendt asked if new systems aren't plugged into this budget, where does that item get plugged in? He felt that whole area is the place for this.

Mr. Ahlberg stated that if we utilize the Federal grants that we have been getting for that purpose, he felt that that would be an excellent opportunity to do that. But they do send to us a list of criteria for which those funds can be spent. Right now, if we set back and look at what Douglas County did, they just passed a bond issue for 3.2 million dollars and replaced all the systems that they had in the City of Omaha - through bond issues. They did it in one fell swoop and got that accomplished. The placement of the warning system is an integral part of where we are.

Mr. Camp asked if developers had been kicking in the needed funds? Mr. Ahlberg stated that they have not. It was his understanding that they were going to. Ms. McRoy stated that they are supposed to. Mr. Ahlberg indicated that that has not occurred. In review of the form that the developer gets to replace or to make payments on certain things - the warning system is not listed.

Mr. Cook commented that the City had left Emergency Services out of the Impact Fee discussion, and apparently they had been left out of the Infrastructure Financing Committee efforts too. Mr. Ahlberg reiterated that he had been of the understanding that they would be included in the Infrastructure discussion.

Discussion continued with Common Members asking about the cross-training being done in the Emergency Services Office. Mr. Ahlberg explained that there was someone being cross-trained to take his position during vacation, etc. The day-to-day operation is being handled well with the volunteer groups now being utilized. Then Y2K happened. To be realistic, during the last four years, he did not see things being anywhere close to resembling what he would classify as normal. His intent was to come before the County Board mid-year and discuss the possibility of hiring either an assistant to the Director, or - at the very minimum - an office manager for down there to insure that Mr. Ahlberg does not miss any fundings that are available, through either Homeland Security or the Department of Justice, etc. As far as Mr. Ahlberg being able to leave town right now, Mr. Kerry Eagan is the back-up person for the Directors' position. Mr. Eagan has done a very good job in going through and receiving training through the Nebraska Emergency Management Agency and through the Federal Emergency Management Agency so he could fill those obligations. But, again - it's one of those situational things wherein he wonders, if anything should happen to him, what contacts would be available at the Federal level. All the funds that are coming in through Homeland Security and the Department of Justice right now are coming through Mr. Ahlberg's office. He noted that he did not want to miss any of those coming through, nor any of all the requirements that he is obligated to fulfill to insure that those funds are available. What he is asking is: if now isn't the time to bring

somebody else in. Douglas County has five people in the Department of Emergency Management. Ten years ago...there were three in Lancaster County.

Mr. Werner asked if the Police or Sheriff's offices couldn't provide a cross-trainee for the position. Mr. Ahlberg explained that the first responders obligations would take those officers and deputies at the same time that Mr. Ahlberg would be needed. If they had to fulfill the obligations at the Emergency Management Center, they would be taken from their duties as first responders when they were most needed.

It was noted that this Department bears a huge responsibility and it was asked if we shouldn't we be thinking of giving even more than is being requested. Mr. Ahlberg noted that everything has been formulated on a check list which can be read and reviewed. It pretty well covers the day-to-day operations and those events that could be handled routinely. But, it seems that, with the advent of 9/11 - things have changed tremendously. We're receiving Federal funding for purchase of equipment, which we've been doing over the past year. We're meeting with the first responders in the City and County to insure that the requests that we are making to utilize the Department of Justice grants are what is needed at this time.

Today in the '03 Supplemental Grant Funds through Homeland Security we will be receiving \$ 190,242,00 - or Initial Responders grants. Mr. Ahlberg noted that the Police, Fire, Sheriff's and the Health Departments should be complemented in that, with the availability of funds, there have been no personal agendas brought forth. - the purchases have been made on the basis of the ultimate goal of what the City and County need to accomplish vs. what each individual agency wants in these categories. There has been a lot of give and take.

The emergency radio system was discussed. There is a very critical need to have the system upgraded. The split between City and County was discussed. Mr. Workman commented on priorities, considering the limited budget funds both the City and County were facing. Common Members requested a break-down of the costs involved in a Deputy Director position and the costs of having new development provide to the new sirens. Mr. Cook noted that the Infrastructure package was pretty well formulated by now, but he would be interested in having those numbers available so the Planning Department would have something to follow-up on....as to where the costs really are for new development.

Mr. Camp asked that Mr. Ahlberg consider having double-duty from somebody in the County Sheriff's Department and the Police Department - perhaps two additional individuals cross-trained - they might get incremental compensation amount, but that way we'd have a triple back-up. Maybe through utilization of resources, we keep it real economical. With budgets as they stand, we need somebody who really knows the procedure and those two agencies would be natural fits.

CORRECTIONS- Mr. Mike Thurber and Ms. Liz Thanel came forward to make the presentation. Mr. Thurber distributed a summary of their presentation. There were also graphs showing the population and what has happened in Corrections since 1991. Since that time, the offender population has grown 49%. In the last 5 years, we've seen that population grow by 32%. We average about 10,000 bookings per year - coming from State and City. These graphs show that Corrections is kind of a growth business and industry...as much as public safety - in any community. This will continue to drive our budget as well as our bed space. We have 271 individuals in the jail currently. We have 237 beds. We've opened an exercise yards and put 16 individuals on the floor. Mr. Thurber explained the steps they were taking to accommodate the over-flow.

There is a second facility at LCF where the population was about 150-160 a year ago. During the last two quarters, we've been able to go under capacity. There are 124 today. We'll be able to maintain that facility within Jail Standards and Compliance.

Budget-wise, there has been an increase of 12%. There are two major issues that have had a direct impact on that increase. Ms. Thanel gave input on personnel issues and those issues that tend to drive up budget costs.

Ms. Thanel reported on the summary passed out to the Common Members. With Personnel Services there is a routine 5% increases on merit & cost of living raises. There were significant increase on

the Health and Dental coverage which every County Agency has experienced over the last two years. We are changing out one RN and turning that into two Nurse I positions so that we can get more medical coverage here at the jail - and looking at more on-call time when we have no coverage. She noted that they were reinstating a correctional officer that had been lost in budget reductions the previous fiscal year. PEP is being reinstated and long-term disability is now available to correctional staff

Pharmaceutical costs always continue to increase because of the development of new drugs that are available and also because of the population increases that go along with our growth. We are looking for \$60,000.00 under services for a pre-architectural design. Our population has increased by 32% in five years. If we wait another five years, with this same growth, we'll be at 512...so we're going to have to do something & we need to start doing it now.

Other services costs are pretty minor. We've cut some temporary services from medical because we're making staffing changes with the additional nurses. We've got some reductions in repairs because we are also budgeting \$400,000 for a surveillance system in the jail. The current security system was developed with late '80s technology. It can't be repaired anymore - it's totally obsolete and there are no parts available. So, as we lose pieces of this equipment, we're going to have to shut down functions in those areas. We are developing an RFP at this point to hire an engineer to come in and look at this system & give us information on what is available and propose a retrofit to a surveillance system in the jail.

The other items are capital outlay, most of which was cut in the last fiscal year. We're looking at \$60,000 for equipment, most of which was cut from last years budget. If you look at the 12-1/2% and you eliminate the security \$400,000 security package and the pre-architectural design (which really aren't routine costs), the increase would be about \$600,000.00

Mr. Thurber added that the control center, which operates all the movement inside the jail....we don't carry keys inside the maximum security facility...when that system is broken, it cannot be repaired. We've lost one of those and we have one back up, but we now have no redundancy in that system. We're hoping that system stays up. The County Board did give us some reserve money in case we had to build one. We hope to use that money in this plan. This plan would expand with any growth in the facilities.

Mr. Thurber noted that a recently completed study would indicate the need for expansion to accommodate the growth of the Lincoln/Lancaster County community.

Mr. Thurber explained the figures on the handouts to Common Members who had questions regarding increases and other changes. The medical expenses for prisoners being brought in who are wounded or require other immediate medical attention was brought forward for discussion. Mr. Thurber explained that the Interlocal Agreement between the City and County discusses these concerns. There has been a change in legislation at the State level that gives an order of how an arrestee or a detainee is dealt with medically once they come into County custody. One of those areas is that during the course of apprehension, if that individual is injured, or has to seek medical during the course of arrest, the cost is borne by the arresting agency. That has been a point of discussion between the County and City for over a year. We feel that should be a fair compromise. The City feels our Interlocal agreement contracted that stipulation away and that the City should not, therefore, bear those costs.

It was explained that the per diem cost for the City's payment to the County is the budget divided by the prior year population, divided by 365 or 366 days. It's updated at the end of the year with the actual population that occurred and the actual expenditures. The County's population is up, but the City pays for only City Ordinance violators. LPD has a choice, and they do it 61% of the time, to write them on a City or a State charge. Mr. Thurber noted that 15% of the Total Days are City Days. The more serious drug charges are one reason for the increase in State charges being written.

Mr. Werner asked about the Health Care costs. He asked where that was reflected in the budget. What amount has been budgeted for that item? Ms. Thanel answered that the information was under

“Health Services” in the Common Budget Package. \$175,000 was budgeted for outside health services. The last fiscal year was \$130,000. Mr. Werner asked if the County paid that entire amount. Mr. Thurber noted that was figured in the per diem costs. Mr. Thurber noted that there needed to be some discussion on the Interlocal Agreement on the medical costs incurred at the time of arrest to reflect the State Statute. It hasn’t been a tremendous issue, but it could become one unless it is addressed soon.

The State has reduced the monies they’ve allocated to the Counties for the care of State prisoners in County facilities for the pre-trial and sentencing time before they’re transferred to the State Penitentiary system. Lancaster County would be collecting about \$800,000 this year under that agreement. The last quarter will not be paid, so we’ll have to put a claim in to the State. They’ve been paying, but have been reducing those payments. We’ll be about \$250,000 this year.

The County had held a US Marshall’s contract which will expire this June. That helped a little bit by not having 17 beds for Federal Inmates there. But, the cutting edge is that we’ll lose the \$400,000 revenue from those beds. It’s a trade - money for space.

Mr. Thurber stated that the jail does meet standards by doubling up in the general population. The cells meet the standards as far as plumbing, natural light, indirect lighting, etc. The other part of double bunking is the staffing concerns. If there are two people in one cell, the additional staff is required for added observation.

BREAK

JUVENILE DIVERSION - Presentation by JD Staff - We try to adjust with the changes and needs of the youth we serve. Part of the Program is the Teen Court Component where the youth are judged by a jury of their peers. Then we have our minority outreach division where we try to reach those youth who do traditionally not enroll in this program. We’ve been very successful with that and have increased our enrollment rate with that program. We have the Truancy Intervention and Prevention Services where all of the youth who are in the program are monitored and intervened with if they have truancy issues. We’ve just added a new prevention component for elementary school students. We’ve done a little research and found that there are some younger children who have some environmental factors that expose them to trancies later on and we work with them. This program was just started July 1st. We have the victim services where we contact the victims and work with the youth on restorative justice principles through the program

The combination of all those different components make a unique structure for the juvenile Diversion Program, which has added to the success of the program. Annually, we receive about 1100-1200 referrals from the City and County. The Split on the referrals is approx 25-30% from the City & the remainder from the County Attorney’s Office. We’ve enrolled about 75-80% of those youth in the Juvenile Diversion Program. Because we have the minority outreach program now, we are able to enroll more youth and we’ve recently been able to enroll anywhere up to 89% of those youth. We do graduate about 75% of those youth yearly. That is about 750 to 1000 youth yearly that we’re able to divert out of the system...so that is a very significant number of young people who are being served.

Over the past year (2002-03) those youth were able to give back to the community by providing over 10,000 hours of community service. That is a significant number of community service hours. The recidivism rate continues to be low. For Fiscal Year 2001-02, the rate was about 78% – that is 78% of the youth who do *Not* re-offend after leaving the program. That seems to be about the average for the last several years from 1999 to 2001-02.

Some of the most common offenses we’re seeing in Juvenile Diversion are shoplifting or theft charges. We’ve seen an increase in assaults and have had to do some adjustments in programing and diversion

for those. There is a significant amount of vandalism, minor in possession of alcohol or drug or drug paraphernalia, criminal mischief and disturbing the peace and burglary. Those are the most common offenses that we work with.

Most of the shoplifting charges do go through the teen court process, which seems to be very effective for those youth. Some of the impact groups that we offer through Juvenile Diversion are Victim Sensitivity Training, Drug and Alcohol Education and Prevention, Programing, Responsible Decision Making. Youth As Resources is a new program that we've added over the last year - where we have a Board of Youth who are able to receive written grants from other youth and are able to either approve or deny the project. If approved, then the Board is able to grant them the amount of money it takes them to do the projects. Some of the projects that have been done were clothing drives for Matt Talbot Kitchen, they've done a restoration of a playground, and most recently they've done some gardening work in one of the parks.

We've done correctional tours, shoplifting presentations, and another new add-on is the tobacco education programing. We do Park Pick-up and Jury Training.

Currently we're asking for \$85,000.00 and the split-out, considering the number of youth that are enrolled in the program, the cost to you would be approximately 49 cents per youth per day. We do try to diversify the funding for this program. We try to find funding from different sources to compensate. Some of the funding at this point comes from the crime commission, from the Juvenile Availability and Incentive Block Grant, the Cedars Foundation and we also collect fees for those.

Ms. Deb Schorr asked if the mini-grant program funds came out of the \$85,000.00? The answer was no. We have funding from another source for that. We've written a small grant for that, so the funding comes from another source.

Mr. Heier commented that the Juvenile Diversion program was doing a great job for the Community. It's a small price we pay for this service.

AGING - Ms. June Remington of the Aging Department came forward to make the presentation. Ms. Remington introduced Dee Fullerton who is the head of accounting for the Aging Services. Ms. Remington explained that of the entire Mayor's Proposed Budget, Aging Services makes up 58% of it.

Ms. Remington reviewed the materials that Common Members had before them. She noted that the Lincoln Area Agency on Aging has four sections: Administrative Services, (includes the Director's Office and Administrative Service functions); Community Activity and Services (includes Senior Centers, Central Kitchen, Transportation Services, Handyman Services, the Lifetime Health Program and Volunteer Services), Personal and Family Services (includes the LIFE Office, Contracts with Local Agencies and Businesses to provide Homemaking, Personal Care Services, Adult Daycare Services and Legal Services to older citizens in the community); Multi-County Services Line (costs of Administration and services provided to other Counties in our eight county service area - that funding is a "pass-through" to the other county programs and that is not part of this budget. There are no City of Lincoln and Lancaster County funds included in the Multi-County Services Line) In addition to the budget presented here, Aging has 24 programs and grants which provide an excess of \$3,000,000 for services to all eight of the county areas.

The percentage increase for the Lincoln Area Agency on Aging is 1.01%. If you look at this year's budget and you reduce it by \$100,400.00 that we had in moving expenses from last year, and add \$52,000.00 we saved in rent in the new building, - factoring those out - the percentage increase we're asking for is. 4.3%.

Ms. Remington reviewed each of the separate sections of the Aging Department budget. (Copy on file in the City Council Office). After the review, Ms. Remington offered to answer any questions the Common Members might have. Mr. Werner asked if there were any efficiencies in the location of the Aging Department next to the Senior Center. He wondered if that had been helpful in reducing any expenditures? Ms. Remington answered that there had been no reduction in Staff, but considerable reduction in staff time.

Combining office supplies, such as postage machines, for the entire Agency has offered savings. For the most part, the advantages are through time savings. We can better utilize the conference rooms in the Senior Centers. Mr. Werner asked if there had been any savings on combined personnel costs - such as a joint receptionist? Ms. Remington indicated that there had been no savings in that respect.

Mr. Werner commented that the \$59,000 reduction for in-home services didn't actually eliminate the program, but only reduced the program. He was concerned that that would be a reduction in services to the most vulnerable. Ms. Remington stated that it is to people who are ineligible for State and Federal programs. So, they have an income level that doesn't allow them to be eligible for the waiver for other services. We may still be able to provide this service if we reduce the level of service -maybe service twice a month instead of once a week.

Mr. Werner's final question was why the user fees would go down? Ms. Fullerton noted that these were the Lifetime Health fees (fitness classes). There will be fewer classes.

Mr. Friendt asked if the new Life Counselor would cost as much as the \$59,000.00? Ms. Remington stated that they would be paying \$56,000.00 with benefits. It will be a City position. Mr. Friendt asked if that would be 1600 hours....noting that seems like a lot of money for a part-time employee. Ms. Remington answered that that was the number of direct hours of service that they will provide the clients, but it will be a full-time position.

Mr. Hudkins complimented Ms. Remington and the Aging Agency for making some tough decisions and trying to find a way to put the Life Counselor back in the budget, because that is a tremendous service to those people who needed it most. He applauded Ms. Remington for making some of these tough management decisions in prioritizing some difficult budget cuts. He noted that one thing that did surprise him was a \$52,000 savings in rent. Is there less square footage, because the current rent is higher per square foot in the new building than had been paid in the Old Building. Ms. Remington noted that what had been included in last year's budget was an estimate of what the new space would cost. We have a significant savings in the rate based on the Lincoln Building - over what was projected. She agreed that it is certainly more expensive than what we used to pay when we were in the Old Federal Building.

There were other questions covering areas not included in this budget process. Mr. Workman asked some specific questions regarding specific percentages of time spent on County Rural Transit Program. It was reported that a study had been done on that issue to see how much time staff spent on the Rural Transit Program and the figures shown in the budget report were the approximate amount.

INFORMATION SERVICES - Mr. Doug Thomas gave the presentation. He passed out summary material which he reviewed for Council, (On File in Council Office). He reported that the operating budget is basically one that we control as well as a pass-through budget covering purchases or other services that other City/County Departments get from outside entities (i.e. Alltel free relay circuit charges - those types of things). We have less control over that portion of the budget There is over-sight authority to maintain some type of control over some of those charges, so that is in the pass-through budget.

The operating budget proposed for next year is up around \$47,000.00 or about 1.03 %. The Pass Through Items are down about \$52,000 - or about a 9% reduction. So the net is a reduction of about \$5,000.00 or 1/10 of One Percent. Our salaries are actually going up about 3.8%, but we had other cuts in other areas and were able to absorb a large portion of that expense - about \$76,000.00 and other operating budget cuts.

Capital Items: There is in the budget a proposition to move forward with expanding the fiber-optic facilities out to the Police precinct and Public Works locations on North 27th. Currently we have an agreement to provide us fiber from the downtown area out to those locations. We want to close that loop. It's just a spike right now, so if there were a break between here and there, they could be cut off, so what we want to do is move another route of fiber to make that one continuous ring, so if there is a break anywhere on the

ring, we still have connectivity. That will probably be a two-year project, of which we have phase one in this budget - \$75,000.00. In addition to that, every year we have additional PCs coming on to the network so we have to buy additional hubs in the County/City building to accommodate those additional PCs - We've got \$25,000 in the budget for that.

Currently, we are piloting "voice-over" IP. Information Services is basically using their data network to carry voice communications as well. We've been doing that for about four months. That's been fairly successful. We're going to expand that to include a couple more departments. This will, once completely implemented, offer several hundred thousands of dollars of savings per year for those circuit charges through local phone services.

Mr. Thoms offered to answer any questions Common Members might have. Mr. Cook asked where the long distance charges are figured in this budget? Mr. Thomas answered that the long distance charges are actually at the agency level. This does not replace that. What we will do, is still voice grade T-1 Lines to a local carrier such as Alltel or Sprint for local services. Again the cost of that versus what we're paying for phones today and for these Centrex Service now would be a significant savings.

Mr. Cook asked if at some point, we could potentially go onto a long distance service through the internet? Mr. Thomas noted that there was a potential for that.

Discussion continued with requests for clarification on some of the line item issues as well as some general non-budget related questions, which Mr. Thomas explained to the Common Members.

PERSONNEL (EXCLUDES RISK MANAGEMENT) - Ms. Georgia Glass made the presentation. She passed out materials to the Common members and reviewed the material for them. (Prior to Ms. Glass's presentation, Mr. Camp asked Steve Hubka, the Budget Officer, if the Budget Office was using the same percentage for fringe benefits across the board? Mr. Hubka answered that it is done department by department, fund by fund, depending on what the department has as far as the number of people they have on Family Health Care, 2/4, or Single. It depends on the number of employees that they have budgeted and what those people are signed up for. So, it's not a number that is applied across the board as an increase). Mr. Camp noted that on average the figure on percentage of benefits to net salary seems to be running about 35% . Mr. Hubka noted that that is pretty much what it's running anymore.

Ms. Glass stated that she didn't really have anything in particular to say - her budget is very straightforward. She has people and supplies. That's about it. The programs that she has are the Mayor's Award of Excellence; Commissioners' Award of Excellence; the Service Awards on the City side. Basically, that is where the Personnel Dollars go - either salaries, supplies or those programs.

She did note that one thing that was new this year is the scanning program they've implemented. There will no longer be paper files, at least in this building. All employment files will be scanned. We've already scanned all of the County employee files. We're starting on the City employee files now. That is a new line item this year that will pay for that. She noted that Records Information Management keeps the hard copies in storage once they've been scanned.

There was some discussion on Risk Management which is a separate Budget entity. There was a question regarding the Police and Fire Pension Fund . Ms. Glass noted that what is significant about the fund is that this year, what is budgeted is to contribute an additional \$250,000.00 to the fund, which brings the City's contribution to almost \$2,000,000.00. That is lower than the actuaries \$3,500,000 recommendation. It was noted that it was estimated on the pension fund that the assumed rate of return would be 7.5% this year - through the end of August. Year to date the rate is 5%.

PLANNING - Mr. Marvin Krout, Jean Walker and Mike DeKalb made the presentation. Mr. Krout thanked the Common for the opportunity to work for the citizens of Lincoln and Lancaster County for the past 10

months. He noted that it had been a pleasure.

He outlined the Planning Department's missions and goals. We try to achieve consensus when we're making recommendations, but the issues we're involved in are often somewhat controversial and that is sometimes difficult. He reported that he has an excellent staff that makes the job much easier.

He commented that the Comprehensive Plan was a great tool to help with long range financial planning to help the community grow. There were three parallel studies dealing with responsible acreage development in the County and the City's Three Mile Jurisdiction area.

He noted that the Comp Plan Annual Review had been a major accomplishment this year. We tried to benchmark for the first time where the community is and whether or not we're meeting the goals that are laid out in the Comp Plan.

In addition to those major projects, many small changes were also undertaken to improve the quality of work the Planning Department is doing. The Directors' Newsletter is something new, we've expanded the written notifications on applications. We've improved the format and the language on the information that the public receives. Hopefully the language is clearer than some of the "plannerese" that you may have seen in the past. Mr. Krout noted that he had reached out to the development community to improve communications as well as internal communications with staff and between departments.

He continued, noting key projects such as the multi-million dollar transportation study; the Downtown Master Plan (including the possibility of an event center and bicycles in the downtown; the bus shuttle system - transportation in general in the downtown area); the Southwest Area Plan (Homestead Expressway Corridor); a number of changes to the Zoning Regulations & Standards; housing; standards for commercial developments; alcohol sales in zoning areas; entry way and public way corridors.

There are a lot of ideas for streamlining the development for due process. We've just taken the first interim steps with more changes that can be made. Some of these ideas and projects will require changes at the State level.

Mr. Krout noted that the Planning Department was asking for a little less money than had been requested for in the 2002-03 budget, because during the last fiscal year, they had over \$100,000 in consultant money to kick-off the implementation of the Comprehensive Plan. He noted that they were asking for \$50,000 this year in the five-year financial plan from the budget office. They've estimated that \$50,000 per year for technical assistance on those dozens of issues that are listed in the Comprehensive Plan. Some of those projects have been put under contract this year, but we're asking to carry over about \$100,000 that is not obligated and use those for the major studies mentioned earlier that we anticipate undertaking this year.

The second major point is the addition of a federally funded position (both salary and benefits) - \$57,000 for a new Transportation Planner. The functions of the budget for the MPO (Metropolitan Planning Organization) which is the federally mandated regional transportation process. The mandate is that it will all move from the Planning Department where it was administered for many years to the Public Works Department. In that process, the previous Planning Director forgot to ask to hold out some of that money that they gave Public Works....so the Public Works Director and Mr. Krout have discoursed on the need to have someone who will be continuing to work on transportation issues - for example on the downtown project, there is parking circulation, the bus shuttle system, the bikeways issues - all of those issues need to be addressed. Planning also has a tradition of public involvement, which is important especially with the Federal Transportation process, so we will continue to have a role in these issues. Public Works has agreed to share the money they expect to receive from federal funding for transportation planning in 03-04 and that will allow us to hire a transportation planner.

Mr. Krout continued, noting other efficiencies he expected to implement. On the Revenue side, they had several projects planned which Mr. Krout reviewed for the Common Members, such as increases in

the fee schedules. Also some modifications and deletions of fees for permits that no longer exist and adding fees for some Planning Department functions. He noted that they expect to increase revenues from \$160,000 to \$200,000, total. We'll be bringing the package of fee schedules for the City applications, then we'll come back and look at the County applications. These schedules will probably be brought forward in August or September. At the same time, we'll be bringing some amendments to the sub-division regulations that will shorten the time frames for processing steps in many sub-division applications.

Mr. Krout stated that he would answer questions for the Common Members. Several Members asked questions regarding some of the application processes and the fee schedules that would be changed or eliminated and the effect this would have on revenues. Questions regarding the addition of the Traffic Planner and the history of that position were put forth and addressed.

Mr. Cook asked if this budget reflects the old fee schedule or the new fee schedule that Council hadn't approved yet? Mr. Krout answered that the revenues were not a direct contribution to the budget, but are just returned to the General Fund. So the budget is based on the General Fund contribution and Federal Transportation money. We're just estimating that we can return more revenue to the General Fund by increasing some of the fees. Mr. Cook noted that even if it's off the Planning budget, if we approve a change in the fee schedule, possibly after the budget is approved, we're accounting for that money. We need to know if we're likely to approve those when we approve the budget. Mr. Krout stated that if there were questions on that, he would be glad to go into it. He noted that most of them are modest increases, but they're more the actual costs which are considerable, and will be, even with some streamlining.

Discussion continued with questions on the personnel costs (such as GIS technicians, and the supervision involved; the salary increase for two positions, which Mr. Krout addressed. A question on the fee revenues was answered by Steve Hubka who stated that the projected revenue from Planning fees was increased by \$40,000 so it is built into the General Fund Revenues as well as the many other revenue sources. Mr. Werner noted that the amount involved would warrant a line-item entry. Mr. Friendt asked of all the line-item revenues, what makes that revenue different than the other revenue - different from that of other Departments? Mr. Hubka stated that it isn't different. He explained that not all fees are shown as separate revenue sources are shown on all the Departments budgets. He noted that that would defeat the purpose of having a General Fund that supports the rest of the Department.

Mr. Werner asked about the transportation studies and asked if there was a shuttle study included in the budget. Mr. Krout noted that that is being considered as part of the Downtown Master Plan, which is where it should be since we can't do a shuttle study without understanding how and where the Downtown is going to be growing and changing in the future. He explained the details further to the satisfaction of the Common Members.

Mr. Cook asked about the notification process to the people who are within 200 feet of a zone change or a special permit location. He asked if Planning charged other Departments for any other services? He was suggesting that they offer Public Works the notification list they're using and charge Public Works for that list. Mr. Krout stated that there is a system on the wireless fees where we collect a deposit from the applicant and then other departments involved charge Planning for the time they spend on the applications, then if there is any money left, we reimburse the applicant, or charge him more, based on the hours spent on the request. He felt User Charges should be undertaken carefully.

Mr. Workman stated that Mr. Hubka had said that the fees and charges go into the City's General Fund. That is an 80-20% split. You're cheating the County. [Laughter] Ms. Walker explained that the fees collected for County permits go to the County...under separate accounting. Mr. Hubka thanked Ms. Walker for her input.

PUBLIC BUILDING COMMISSION - Mr. Don Killeen made the presentation. He passed out informational material to the Common Members which is on file in the Council Office. He noted that the Expense side

shows 4.4% increase over last year, but there are a couple of additions and subtractions that come into play on that. One, the Old Federal Building has been deleted which had come out of the portfolio management of the PBC. Also deleted was the Health Department Bond payment because we re-financed that bond which was split up so the City and County were on different schedules. That bond payment is being paid directly by both entities instead of being funneled through the PBC. An addition is the Parking Garage Bond payment - the first large bond payment which becomes due at the end of this next fiscal year.

The only other change is the transfer from the Health Department building, moving from contract cleaning to in-house cleaning. So that amount is moved from Services to Personnel. In past years we've had to ask the City and County to subsidize the Master Plan Bond payment - last year about \$125,000 from each entity. This year we are projecting that the tax levy will cover that \$29,000,000 dollar bond. This is the first year we've reached that plateau.

Upon questioning, Mr. Killeen explained line item adjustments that only involved the transfer of funds from one line-item to another. Other non-budgetary issues were discussed briefly.

Mr. Werner stated that he had a budget question. He asked why the parking fund is going up so high? Mr. Killeen answered that the increase was to meet the first bond payment of \$659,000 which will occur at the end of the next fiscal year. In order to work toward building that fund, we've done two things. One was a \$1.25 per square foot sur-charge on the rental space in all the PBC-operated buildings. The other is a \$30.00 per month individual tag fee charged to every department for the purple and green tag parkers.

Mr. Werner noted that most of that is coming internally, basically in the form of rent. He asked, then, if the tax levy rate would go down? Mr. Killeen answered that it would not. This would be based on the 1.7, which is under State Statute the maximum allowed. Mr. Killeen noted that both he and Mr. Roper are fairly confident that until the bond payment requirements were met....and this would be the first year we were able to do that....that the bond documents on the Master Plan Bonds of \$49,000,000 required that we do the maximum of 1.7 cents until that levy can service the bond payment.

Continued questions regarding personnel costs were answered by Mr. Killeen. Parking fees for the public in the new parking garage as another source of revenue was explained briefly.

DIVERSION SERVICES - Mr. McMaster passed out material to Common Members. He reported on the projects that Diversion Services are currently involved with: Lancaster County's Adult Diversion Program for the City Attorney and County Attorney; the County Attorney's Bad Check Restitution Program; Co-Administer for the STOP Traffic Diversion program (a 90% City Program). Mr. McMasters also gave a brief summary of the other programs he operates for various cities around the nation as well as a brief history of his programs here in Lincoln/Lancaster County.

He briefly outlined the material he passed out to the Common Members. He noted that he had reduced the City/County funding because of the significant increase in the STOP program charges over the last year. He explained that it was fair to say that the State will be much more involved in the STOP programs regulation, including setting fees and directing where those fees will go and how they'll be used. That will effect all of us. He noted that this year's projections for City generated STOP revenue would be approx \$110,000 which goes to off-set the cost of the prosecution of tickets. Lancaster County revenue will be approx. \$25,000 and the Law Enforcement Equipment Fund - approximately \$90,000.

Mr. McMaster gave a brief update on the City Diversion Program operations over the past year, stating figures of caseload. The diversion clients paid \$147,000 in restitution through program fees. Community Services hours were significant - especially for the City. Most of the Community Service work is done by the City Misdemeanor Cases. He reviewed the STOP program in more detail, noting that figures have increased in the program because the number of persons taking part in the program had increased significantly. The State has enacted a law that will lower the number of times an offender can take the STOP program from once every two years to once every three years - which will have an unknown impact on next

years budget.

After Mr. McMaster finished his review of the Diversion Programs and their processes, he opened the floor for questions from the Common Members.

Mr. Workman asked how much the City and County pay for the Diversion Program. For Fiscal Year 2003-04, the City is requested to contribute \$35,000 and the County to contribute \$35,000. Mr. Svoboda asked if there were a cost-benefit of what the Diversion Program actually saves the City and County by diverting these offenders through your operation? Mr. McMasters stated that there had been a lot of studies done in the past on other offenses, and he could show figures on the STOP program. There was a cost benefit to the City and County both, though it is not huge, but the direct benefit from the STOP program is for a contribution of \$38,000 last year and the STOP Program returned a net of \$130,000. The County's net return was \$12,000 to the good. Mr. Svoboda asked if there were other cities or counties that operate systems similar to this on a cost-neutral basis, where the program is totally self-supporting (an all-fee generated funding). Mr. McMaster didn't know of any that are totally fee funded. Mr. Svoboda asked if there were any mandates that we can't be self-sufficient in these programs? Mr. McMaster answered, of course not.

After discussion, it was noted that the return certainly off-set the cost to both the City and County. Mr. McMaster noted that the money received from the City and County was the difference of operating in the red or in the black. Mr. Hudkins noted that businesses appreciated the restitution program.

911 COMMUNICATION & RADIO MAINTENANCE - Ms. Julie Righter, Communication Coordinator for 911 came forward to make the presentation. She gave a brief history of the 911 operations. She noted that the service area is about 900 square miles, adding that they do not just cover Lincoln and Lancaster County. Ms. Righter commented that she had included in her hand-out material the more interesting aspects of the budget as well as the things that came out of the Hometown Security Committee.

She explained the operations of the 911 Communications and Radio Maintenance Service, noting that the Radio Maintenance division maintains the City's radio system which is also used by a lot of county agencies. In the Radio Maintenance budget, those using rates were increased for the first time in several years with an 8% increase. Everybody pays the same amount based on the type of equipment they have. There are now over 2300 radios on the City's 800MgH System, which are also maintained by the City Radio Shop.

The Communications Center Budget Detail: An addition of \$22,500 which is the operating budget for the back-up communications center (dedicated earlier this year). It was a C.I.P. which was moved up and completed.

There was a re-allocation of the Senior Office Assistant to Assistant Specialist I. This was done to better utilize the person in that position, who has a great technical knowledge - a lot of telephone/communications background. With our many technology based systems, she is a real asset to the Department - beyond just doing our administrative work.

Other personnel were added (five additional entry level dispatch positions for this fiscal year and two for the following fiscal year) That recommendation came from the Hometown Security Committee. This was not linked to the additional 50 cent 911 sur-charge. The Committee intentionally broke those into two recommendations because they felt that the need was that we, very soon, play catch up by adding to our staff and that should not be tied to the sur-charge. The sur-charge fees must be spent on Communication equipment only. 911 Radio replacement is necessary for the public safety.

Some Common Members voiced concern with the 911 Service Surcharge on the General Fund when it is regarding hometown security. It was mentioned, too, that the 50 cent sur-charge on 911 Services was being looked at on the State level as well.

After the Budget Presentations were completed, Mr. Bob Workman requested a time for

discussion regarding the prioritization of the funded programs in light of the very tight budgets under which both the City and County were operating this fiscal year. Discussion included all of the mutually funded programs that were presented this evening, with a special emphasis on the Women's Commission. Lengthy discussion revealed concerns that over-lapping and redundant services should be noted and eliminated in order to maintain a prudent disposition of tax dollars while maintaining an adequate level of service. In order for the Common Members to jointly review these issues in greater detail, a meeting was scheduled for July 24th.

OLD BUSINESS - None

NEW BUSINESS - None

ADJOURNMENT - Mr. Svoboda called for adjournment. The motion was made and seconded and the meeting was declared adjourned by unanimous consensus at approximately 9:20 p.m.

*Submitted by
Joan V. Ray
Council Secretary*

Commonminutes070803